DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 902 EA 010 382

AUTHOR [Miller, Brian P.]
TITLE Summary of the Arizona State University USOE Project to Assess Needed Competencies in Community Education.
INSTITUTION Arizona State Univ., Tempe.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 11p.; For a related document, see ED 146 704

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Qualifications; *Community Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Job Analysis; Needs Assessment; Occupational Information; Performance Criteria; Program Descriptions; *Self Evaluation; Task Performance; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

Three workshops were held for the purpose of identifying principal competencies in four roles involved in the administration of community education: superintendent, district coordinator, principal, and building director. The first workshop provided initial lists of competencies by roles. The second workshop produced the list of edited competency statements that was then administered by mail to the participants of the first workshop. The third workshop provided the opportunity to compare the ideal profile against the self assessments provided by the participants. Participant evaluation responses indicated that the project generated unusual support in on-the-job performance assessment, and built or was supportive of significant interest in research and development work relative to the improvement of community education and its administration. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED151902

SUMMARY OF THE ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY USOE PROJECT TO ASSESS NEEDED COMPETENCIES IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION

The Arizona State University USOE Project to Assess Needed Competencies in Community Education consisted of a series of workshops designed to lead to the identification and validation of task areas and competencies, in addition to bringing about reflection and self-assessment by administrators of their tasks.

The purpose of the first workshop was to attempt to develop an exhaustive list of tasks and competencies needed in the development and administration of Community Education programs. In order to help achieve this purpose, Lloyd McCleary of the University of Utah acted as the keynote speaker at the workshop. Practitioners met in work groups by role to examine role expectations, identify administrative task areas, and begin developing statements descriptive of competencies within each task area. The workshop program was designed for both large and small group sessions.

A planning session was held in January of 1977 to prepare for the second workshop. Materials produced at the first workshop sessions were planned; and presenters were given directions for their participation. In the planning sessions, specific objectives for the second workshop were finalized and workshop procedures to accomplish objectives were agreed upon.

The second workshop, held at the Sunburst Hotel in Scottsdale, Arizona, was based upon a panel method in order to review competencies developed in the first workshop, condense statements

EA 010 382

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian P. Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

to eliminate duplication, examine "fit" across roles, and edit a final list of competencies to be employed in the phase of the project to attain ideal ratings. The program format for this workshop was similar to the first in that the participants met in both large and small group sessions.

Planning sessions for the third workshop, and a University and State Department workshop were held periodically from January through April. During this period, instruments were constructed for data collection by mail of the IDEAL ratings of competencies. In February, the instrument to collect ratings was completed and mailed to all participants of the first workshop.

The project director and consultant met in March to process data collected from the February mailing. Results were tabulated and analyzed. Third workshop plans were prepared including: (1) development of the self-rating instrument, (2) preparation of the program, (3) review of the participant list, etc. At this time, an agenda was also developed for a State Department and University workshop to be held April 28. On April 28, 12 participants from a three-state area met to develop tasks, competencies, and indicators for Community Education administrators active in roles in state departments of education and universities.

On April 29, 69 Community Education practitioners met in a final session to examine the product of the first two workshops and to complete and evaluate a self-assessment instrument. During this third workshop, participants also generated plans and improvements for future developmental work.

The conduct of the project led to the accomplishment of key

Project objectives:

(1) -to assess and determine competencies needed by Community Educators
-validation by each group
-cross validation

(2) -cause administrators to reflect what they are about in their work
-self assessment
-certification
licensed, based on real and measurable skills vs. acquisition of transcripts or degrees that may or may not reflect acquisition of needed skills

The field-based approach enabled not only the identification of key task areas and competencies, it also created a climate of self-renewal through the collective evaluation of roles and the consequent real and comparative ideal prioritization of tasks and competencies. Also, resultant data and final product gained a high degree of acceptance, due to its field validity.

OUTCOMES OF THE PROJECT

Outcomes of the project are provided in two primary forms- Product and Process.

Product Outcomes: Major task areas were identified by project participants and subsequent competencies for each area were proposed and developed in each of the four role categories. Competency statements developed in the first workshop were revised, edited and improved in comprehensiveness and clarity in the second workshop. A panel method was employed for this purpose.

Competency statements were developed for each of the four role categories: Superintendents of Community Education.

Principals of Community Education, coordinators of Community Education, and Building Directors of Community Education. In total, 20 major task areas and 98 competency statements were identified by the project participants. From this work, the Ideal Form of the Competency Rating Instrument was prepared and administered. The results provided the Ideal Profile against which self assessments (Real Form) results of each participant were compared.

The QAM was then employed to categorized statements in terms of High Ideal - Low Real, Low Ideal - High Real, and Low Ideal - Low Real. The resulting prioritizing of competencies provided data for pre-service and in-service training needs as described in the Findings and the Applications.

Process Outcomes: The involvement of more than 100 Community Education administrators, professors and state agency personnel in the project provided for three types of process outcomes.

The first process outcome was the involvement of project participants in defining in specific and measurable terms the four administrative roles primarily associated with the delivery of Community Education. The act of verbalizing a description of each competency, developing the description to written statements, reaching agreement about its meaning and the behavorial indicators that could be employed to make judgments about a competency provided significant insights into the nature of the role and the administrative knowledge and skills needed by practitioners. Participants experienced a high degree of gratification upon gaining additional clarification into their Real and comparative

Ideal roles descriptions.

A second process outcome was realized when each group prioritized competency statements by ranking each statement as to its relative importance. The thought processes and subsequent discussion was of considerable value in clarifying to each participant the relative importance of the competencies described for each role. A "competencies classification" resulted which provided a prioritized listing of competencies in each of four roles. This listing was then cast into what was termed the "ideal" profile for each role.

The third process outcome of project activities was evidenced in the form of a self-assessment exercise. Each participant was able to evaluate and compare his competency profile with that of a composite group "ideal" profile. Consequently, they were able to determine the amount of congruence between their self-assessment and a norm provided by the Ideal profile for that role.

PROJECT RESULTS AND FINDINGS

As reported previously, three workshops were held for the purpose of identifying principal competencies in four roles involved in the administration of Community Education: superintendent, district coordinator, principal, and building director. Districts participated as teams with representatives of each role. The first workshop provided initial lists of competencies by roles.

The work of the second workshop, which employed a panel

method, produced the list of edited competency statements which became the Ideal Form which was then administered by mail to the sample that comprised the first workshop. Each participant responded to the form for the role which he occupied. Each participant responded to each competency statement three times: first, on a five-point scale of importance; second, a rating of level of competency needed for adequate performance in the role; and third, on a check list of where each competency should be attained.

The third workshop provided the opportunity to (1) present the entire work to individuals who had not previously participated, (2) conduct a trial self assessment using the Real Form, (3) present the data of the Ideal ratings and permit comparisons of the Ideal profile with the Real ratings, and (4) receive reactions of participants.

The Ideal Profiles for each role were presented in the third workshop after participants completed a Real Form of the same instrument-in the Real Form participants rate themselves as a self assessment of their own performance in the role. Groups were formed on the basis of the four roles in order to examine and react to the Ideal Profile Form and then again to examine Real self-ratings versus the Ideal Profile.

These reactions were collected and form the basis for a revision of the Ideal Profile Form. Participants gave helpful suggestions regarding directions, wording of specific items, use of "indicators" for each competency statement, and the like. There was general agreement that the statements represented

valid descriptions of competencies and that respondents understood the statements and could provide meaningful ratings of performance in terms of them. The exercise of self assessment indicates that the instruments and the process have now been sufficiently developed that field testing and use of them is indicated. Instruments for each role, in Ideal and Real Forms, with task areas, competency statements, and indicators are now available for use.

COMPETENCY RATINGS ON PREFERRED TRAINING TO ACQUIRE COMPETENCY AND LEVEL OF TRAINING JUDGED NECESSARY FOR ADEQUATE PERFORMANCE

In addition to ratings of competency statements in terms of importance to adequate performance which were employed to obtain the Ideal profiles for each role, two additional ratings were obtained for each competency. One rating was the preferred type of training for acquiring the competency and the second rating was the level of competency judged to be necessary for adequate performance.

Regarding preferred type of training, it was assumed that past experience of the rater might influence heavily the ratings of items. That is, an individual who had acquired a competency in in-service education may, without giving serious consideration, judge that in-service education would be the appropriate and preferred way to acquire that competency. In the work groups writing statements during the first workshop and in the panels during the second workshop, this question was explored at some

length and several individuals were interviewed about how they would respond and then were asked where they had acquired the competency. Sufficient discrepancies occurred and discussion indicated that practitioners were objective and rational about such judgments and were not unduly biased in this regard. Respondents made choices based upon rational grounds and were articulate about the reasons for their choices.

As the methodology which underlies competency theory becomes accepted and is employed in program planning, design of training, role analysis and performance assessment, regular collection and analysis of these types of data on a wide scale will be highly useful.

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

Data generated by the project activities are themselves an internal evaluation. The methodology, instruments, and the computer program proved workable and cost-effective for an participating district which has an assessment procedure for administrators and an on-going in-service development program. The validation procedures employed and the reactions of participants to the instruments and methodology are reported in the final report.

In addition to the steps taken above an evaluation was carried out of reactions of participants to each phase of the project. Instruments were administered after each of the three workshops-the last was an overall response to the projects' purposes, methods, and conduct of meetings.

Method and Instrumentation: Evaluation items were prepared which related directly to project purposes, methods, outcomes, involvement, conduct of meetings, arrangements, and willingness to participate in follow-up activities. To these a five-point Likert-type scale was added to obtain participant responses. In addition, open-ended categories were provided to obtain reactions. Only the overall project evaluation is given here but the individual workshop responses were similar.

RESULTS

A total of one hundred eleven indiviudals participated, although all individuals were not invited to all workshops. Feedback was highly positive from all types of responses. Written responses were generally supportive of the method used and the results obtained. The underlying average of participants was that the activity was important, was of a high value to them personally, and that they were willing to continue with follow-on activity related to this work. Reponses indicated that the project clearly accomplished its objectives, generated unusual support in a sensitive undertaking such as on-the-job performance assessment, and built or was supportive of significant interest in research and development work relative to the improvement of Community Education and its administration.

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES AND ENCUMBRANCES/NEEDED COMPETENCIES IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION WORKSHOPS SEPTEMBER 7, 1977

ORIGINAL BUDGET $18,471

	ENCUMBERED	PAID
SUPPLIES		$ 596.74
FOOD AND LODGING		3,273.77
PRINTING		552.15
MAILING		116.49
CONSULTANTS		5,918.85
TRANSPORTATION		2,839.83
OVERHEAD	$255.00	1,113.88
WAGES/RELATED EXPENSES		614.74
TOTAL	$255.00	$15,026.45

BALANCE $3,189.55